

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figure 3. This sheet, which includes Fig. 3, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 3.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

### REMARKS

Applicant thanks Examiner for his thorough examination of this application and a telephone interview on June 27, 2008. Applicant has amended the claims according to the discussion of the interview and suggestions of the Examiner and believes the claims to be allowable based on the amendment and the telephone interview.

#### Summary of Interview

In the interview, the differences between the system of Wichert and that of claim 1 were discussed. Proposed changes to the claims in order to attain allowability were proposed and discussed. An amendment to one of the figures and the specification was discussed.

#### Claim Rejections

Examiner rejected the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant respectfully submits that the dc device of claim 1 is described on page 6, lines 5-7 in the summary portion of the specification. This was discussed in the telephone interview.

Applicant has amended Fig. 3 to include the dc device 29. Applicant has also amended the specification to repeat the paragraph from the summary to the detailed description and thus provide reference to the dc device in the detailed description in addition to the brief summary.

Attached to this response is replacement sheet 3 wherein Fig. 3 has been amended to include the dc device in the location described. No new matter has been added. In particular, the original application described a device connected to the dc bus bar and the Figures have been amended to agree with the specification as originally filed to show this element. Many such devices are well known in the art and any one of which is acceptable for use.

Applicant respectfully submits that in light of the specification and the replacement sheet, claims 1 and 19 are now allowable under 35 U.S.C. 112. Claims 2-6, 8-17, 25-35 which depend from claim 1 and claims 21-23 which depend from claim 19 should also be allowable under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Claims 1 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wichert ("PV-Diesel Hybrid Energy Systems for Remote Area Power Generation – A Review of Current Practice and Future Developments"). Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the bus bar feeds electrical power to the ac network, the power then being unidirectional from the dc bus bar to the ac network. It also claims a dc device coupled to the dc bus bar to detect the electrical power required in the ac network. Wichert does not disclose such a device; nor is such a device inherent in Wichert's teaching. The common method of detecting demand in an AC network is to monitor the frequency of the AC network. Monitoring a frequency in an AC network necessarily happens from the AC side. In other words, a dc device coupled to the dc bus bar to detect the electrical power required in the AC network is not shown in the system of Wichert.

Furthermore, the system of Wichert functions differently from the network of claim 1. Fig. 4 of page 20 of Wichert discloses several dc power sources connected to a dc bus and an AC power source connected to an AC bus. A bi-directional inverter allows for supplying the dc and ac loads with ac and dc power respectively. Thus Wichert discloses a different type of system with bidirectional power flow between the AC and DC buses. There are both AC and DC loads. In a system like Wickerts, it would not be obvious to attach a dc device to the dc bus bar to determine AC load. The dc bus has a dc load itself and if the dc bus according to Fig. 1 or Fig. 4 is to detect any demand, it would run into the added complication of sorting out if the power is required at the AC or DC load. On the other hand, in the present inventive system, the power flows unidirectional from the dc bus bar to the ac load.. Thus not only is the dc device of claims 1 and 19 not inherent in Wichert, it is unobvious to use such a device with Wichert.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 19 are allowable over Wichert because the features of the claims are not disclosed in Wichert, nor would it be obvious to use them in the system of Wichert. Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 2-6, 8-17, 21-23, 25-35 which depend from allowable claims 1 and 19 are also allowable for at least the same reasons.

The Director is authorized to charge any additional fees due by way of this Amendment, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 19-1090.

Application No. 10/506,944  
Reply to Office Action dated March 11, 2008

All of the claims remaining in the application are now clearly allowable.  
Favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC

/David V. Carlson/  
David V. Carlson  
Registration No. 31,153

DVC:lcs

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 5400  
Seattle, Washington 98104  
Phone: (206) 622-4900  
Fax: (206) 682-6031

1216668\_1.DOC – CLEAN VERSION